

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheets of drawings include replacement sheets for Figures 1-11.

In replacement Figures 1-11 the legend "PRIOR ART" has been added.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets of Figures 1-11.

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner objected to the drawings; objected to the title of the invention; objected to claims 1-32<sup>2</sup>; rejected claims 13, 16, 21, 24, 29, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101; rejected claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112; and rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0199859 A1 to Matsumoto ("*Matsumoto*").

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended the drawings, title, and claims 1-12 and 14-16. Claims 1-12 and 14-16 remain pending.

Applicant amended the drawings to include the legend "PRIOR ART" in Figures 1-11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Applicant has amended the title to read: "DECODING METHOD AND DEVICE FOR DECODING LINEAR CODE." The new title is indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 12, and 14-16 to recite "one '1'" as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to claims 1-12 and 14-16.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

<sup>2</sup> Claims 13 and 17-32 had been previously cancelled by Applicant. See Preliminary Amendment, filed January 28, 2005. Therefore, the objections and rejections of claims 13 and 17-32 are improper and Applicant will only address the objections and rejections of claims 1-12 and 14-16.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 16, as amended recites a “computer-readable storage medium, storing a program.” Claim 16 recites a statutory article of manufacture and is directed to statutory subject matter. Thus, claim 16 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, the Examiner should withdraw the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and asserts that claims 2 and 7, as amended, meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Matsumoto*.

*Matsumoto* is not prior art against this application. To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), an international application must designate the United States and must have been published in the English language. *Matsumoto*’s counterpart international application (PCT/JP03/02331) did not publish in English. PCT/JP03/02331 published in Japanese as WO2003/073621, and the publication date (September 4, 2003) of WO2003/073621 is later than the earliest effective filing date (March 30, 2003) of this application. Accordingly, *Matsumoto* cannot be used as prior art to claims 1-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e).

To establish priority to March 30, 2003, Applicant submits an English translation of Japanese patent application no. 2003-153927, and a statement of accurate translation.

*Matsumoto* further fails to disclose a method for decoding a linear code including "reducing a density of a check matrix of the linear code by reducing a density of elements included in the check matrix and having values that are determined to be one '1,'" as recited, for example, in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 17, 2008

By: 

Michael R. Kelly  
Reg. No. 33,921